UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The Jewish Nightmare in Palestine - - - - - - - - *W. Rupert Holloway*

Toward Clarification of Thought on the War Situation - - *Curtis W. Reese*

War: Causes and Cures - *Victor S. Yarros*

Sweden's Government Subsidizes Peace! - - - - - - - - - *Devere Allen*

A Peace Offensive - *Lola Maverick Lloyd*

THE STUDY TABLE

VOLUME CXXV NUMBER 9

Chicago, July 1, 1940

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 131

ARTICLES—
The Jewish Nightmare in Palestine—W. RUPERT HOLLOWAY 134
Toward Clarification of Thought on the War Situation—CURTIS W. REESE 136
War: Causes and Cures—VICTOR S. YARROS 137
Sweden's Government Subsidizes Peace!—DEVERE ALLEN 139
A Peace Offensive—LOLA MAVERICK LLOYD 140
On the Pacifist Front—XVII 141

POETRY—
The Infinite—VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH 142

THE STUDY TABLE—
The Duty Not to Conform—RALPH CHEYNEY 143
The Story of a Great American Woman—CHARLES A. HAWLEY .. 143

CORRESPONDENCE—
Complaint—and Answer—ALBERT C. WILKINSON and JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 144

THE FIELD—
Pacifism Alone Is Vindicated—H. RUNHAM BROWN 130
George Lansbury's Last Letter—GEORGE LANSBURY 130
Somewhere in Russia 144

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The following items are excerpts from the May issue of the *War Resister* (London):

Pacifism Alone Is Vindicated

Pacifism, a way of life, a way without violence, is being vindicated in the wars of the present time. In the senseless war to protect little nations, no little nation has had protection. In this war for liberty, individual liberty must succumb to the totalitarian war. Twenty years of war since the last Great War, ended in another war to end war—a war entered into without enthusiasm, hated and feared by all peoples alike. It is a strange new war; what invisible hand holds the world back? War stands condemned; it has failed. What misery lies ahead of us all? If that unseen hand is now to be lifted and all the forces of violence are to be let loose, what greater misery is in store?

Pacifism has not failed; it looked rather difficult and so it was not tried. Why not now? What rejoicing among all the peoples, and why not? All the peoples want peace; only Governments and dictators need to save their faces. Better that they should hide their faces! Let the peoples say "No!" Peace now is possible. It may not be a good peace, but the worst peace is better than the best war. Think of the agony of Finland. Her peace is not a good peace, but the war was senseless and to have prolonged the war would have meant greater agony and a worse peace. Finland had brave men who dared to make peace with a war yet undecided. Have we no brave men, or do we all fear to make peace? There is no better time to make peace than when the chances of war are unknown. A negotiated peace may be the beginning of real peace, but a dictated peace is the beginning of a new war.

Pacifism is not a meek submission to injustice; it is a new way of life, a new way of resisting evil. Its success depends on what we are willing to give, on justice—on the big vision. Peace now—the sooner the peace, the better the peace.

A group of W.R.I. members have just published *Peace Now—the Basis of a Settlement*. Here they have tried to set out what could, if we would, be done to gain peace even now and how we could, if we had the will, begin to build a new world. Is the spirit lacking?

H. RUNHAM BROWN.

George Lansbury's Last Letter

Bow.

Dear Grace,

Many thanks for your letter and its messages. I cannot write to everyone so please let them all know, when you write another general letter, I do very much appreciate the

(*Continued on page* 143)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXV MONDAY, July 1, 1940 No. 9

GO NOT TO WAR!

Go not to war except in your own heart,
To quell unreason and tear greed apart.
Take up your sword to guard that quiet gate
Against blind hatred in a world of hate.
Go not to war—there's not a cause that gives
Life to a soldier who no longer lives.
No eloquence in how enduring stone
Makes unknown soldiers, to future, known.
Go not to war! If Peace has lost her war,
There is no other thing worth fighting for.

ROBERT HILLYER, in
A Letter to My Son.

PREPAREDNESS

Does anybody suppose that there would be any chance at all of keeping this nation out of the European War if we were prepared to fight? Does anybody imagine that there will be any chance at all of keeping this nation out of the war once we are prepared, or have begun preparation, along the lines now being laid down by the administration? The one thing that is holding back even the generals and admirals today is the hard, cold fact that we have nothing with which to fight against so formidable an antagonist as Adolf Hitler. Give us the navy, the army, and the airplanes for which we are now appropriating billions of dollars, and not all the prayers of all the mothers in the land can keep us out of the European hell. Just to the extent, in other words, that we are preparing to defend ourselves, to quote the specious hypocrisy of the hour, just to this same extent we are preparing to leap aggressively into the fray. All of which only proves anew the pacifist philosophy—that preparedness is one of the wide open doors to war!

"NOTHING TO FEAR BUT FEAR"

Against all the talk of the President these days, we set the statement made in his First Inaugural Address —if true yesterday in the fateful collapse of an economic system, then equally true today in the fateful collapse of an international system!—*"America has nothing to fear but fear."* Why is the President not reminding us of this psychological truism today, when men need nothing quite so much as courage and a clear mind? Why, on the contrary, is he himself leading the outcry of hysterical fright, and thus stirring the American people to such a panic as they have never before known in all their history? We think it time to speak out in this matter of the President's demagoguery in shouting the cry of needless and heedless alarm. From the address to Congress asking for increased armaments to the latest speech at Charlottesville on Italy's entrance into the war, Mr. Roosevelt's utterances have been those not of a responsible statesman in the most fateful hour in modern history but rather of an irresponsible scaremonger. As one of our wisest friends and a frequent contributor to UNITY puts it: "The President is crying 'fire' in a crowded theatre, with the fire still many blocks away." That the theatre should be emptied, that America should do everything in its power to protect itself from possibilities of disaster—this we will not dispute. But this requires words of prudence and not of panic, a sober leadership and not an excited rush of alarm. To awaken the American people to the realities of the hour in such terms that the citizen of Omaha looks fearfully to the skies in anticipation of enemy bombing planes to raze his city is well-nigh a crime. It savors all too much of what Orson Welles did when he broadcasted the H. G. Wells' terror-story of the invasion from Mars. What wonder that, in the former as in the latter case, there have come panic, hysteria, the disordered distraction of a thoroughly frightened people. This country is not at war; it stands in no danger of invasion. But if the President continues his present performance, and on top of this is given a license for another four years, then we will be at war, and the country will be in danger of invasion. And nobody will be so much to blame as Mr. Roosevelt!

AU REVOIR—FRANCE

The surrender of Paris and the capitulation of France represent a transformation of our world so cataclysmic as to be beyond all realization. These events mark in actuality the collapse of our western world which we have been so long talking about without believing for a moment that it ever would come to pass. But it *has* come to pass—and we must make adjustment as best we can. Meanwhile the shock of it all has been lessened a bit by the fact that, for a few dreadful days, we were made to contemplate an even more dreadful calamity—namely, the out-and-out destruction of Paris and France

together. Thus, as the German hosts drew near to the French capital, we were told that the city would be defended block by block, house by house, until not one stone was left standing upon another. Anything more criminal than this could scarcely be imagined, for Paris is the most beautiful city in the world, the incomparable crown of man's artistic achievement upon this earth, and has for centuries belonged not to France merely but to the world. How could such a priceless gem be cast, for however sacrificial a purpose, into war's devouring furnace? Then came wiser counsels—and Paris was saved! There was, after all, a price too high to pay for defense to the last ditch. But if Paris could thus be saved without disgrace, why not France also? Yet immediately there came the dreadful rumor that this lovely land was going to be defended until her last square foot of soil had been burned, and her last inhabitant, we presume, killed. But how was this saving France? How much of France is left after her territory has been turned into a desert salted by the bones of her multitudinous dead? Then, to the world's mingled sorrow and relief, there came the announcement of capitulation. France was delivered—if to the enemy today, then as surely to a new freedom and a fairer life in some day after today. Which raises a kind of final question—why was a war, now so quickly done, ever at all begun? There was a better way last September than the resort to the arms which are now destroying us. The Polish question could have been settled—and the task begun of reordering the world on the basis exacted by the new forces of our time. Suppose we could go back again! Would we again choose war?

LINDBERGH AND THE WAR

Colonel Lindbergh's broadcasts are of enormous significance. The abuse to which he is subjected is an accurate measure of the estimate placed upon his influence by the war-advocates of the day. The charge that he is a pro-Nazi is too silly for words. This is the charge which will be leveled in a few months at all of us who fail to lock-step at the bugle call from the White House. Colonel Lindbergh is important, first of all, because of his authority in the field most closely related to the problem of the possible invasion of this country —namely, aviation. Two years ago he returned from a European inspection tour, and stated that the Russian air force was no good, and that the German air force was incomparably superior to that of England and France. My, how he was denounced by ardent patrioteers who wanted the Allied air force to be better than the German, and therefore insisted that it was! Now we know, as we should have known then, that the Colonel knew what he was talking about. And he knows today when he declares that an air invasion of America is ridiculous—that no existing bombing planes can cross the Atlantic and return. If we leave Europe alone and watch our own shores, there is no possibility of any nation touching us. It is the irrefutable finality of this statement that makes the warmongers rage and the hysteriots plunge into paroxysms of abuse when this calm, strong man says his say. But Colonel Lindbergh is important also because he speaks not so much for himself as for the stalwart group of peace-loving senators and representatives in Washington who would save this country from the deadly peril now confronting it. Already there are those who are at this moment, he says, plotting and planning to take America into a war against Germany. For the group in Washington who would oppose this move, and for the great inarticulate masses of men and women who ask only that this country remain at peace, Colonel Lindbergh is the mouthpiece. When he speaks, the silent heart of the masses is at last given utterance. We want to say, in all sincerity, that the latest of Colonel Lindbergh's radio speeches, apart from its concession to the preparedness panic, was the most statesmanlike word that America has heard since the war began—calm, far-visioned, strong. It made certain other speeches, of which we can think, mere "chatter" indeed.

IF WE GO TO WAR!

To all intents and purposes, America is now in the war. The Neutrality Act is a sham—or at least its enforcement is a sham. We have definitely aligned ourselves with the Allies—are supplying them with airplanes, and will soon be sending them destroyers, to say nothing of munitions and materials galore. A few more steps, and a technical neutrality will become a definite belligerency—and we shall be at war! Then what will happen? Conscription, immediately. Every individual, every corporation, every organization will be conscripted into the public service. Workers will be as rigorously under orders as soldiers. Trade unions will cease to exist; labor laws will be repealed or ignored; in totalitarian America, as in totalitarian Italy or Germany, the people will be slaves to the government. Our young men will immediately begin to be killed—first in the air and naval service, then later in the military service. Thousands and tens of thousands of names will appear on casualty lists, and hundreds of thousands of mutilated and insane youth will crowd our hospitals. The expenses of the war will be enormous, and taxation unprecedented. The national debt will leap in a few months to a hundred billion dollars. To meet or sustain this debt, all private wealth and property will be taken over by the government. A man's savings bank account, for example, will be no longer his own, but will be appropriated or seized for war purposes. Then, in due course, will come the pension burden, to be carried by our children and children's children for the next one hundred years. Civil liberties will disappear in a night. The radio will

be a government monopoly, newspapers will be regimented and controlled, public discussions of public questions will be denied, even public worship will be restricted to the formalities of prayer and praise. As the war goes on and the future darkens, political processes will be suspended—elections will be abandoned, Congress adjourned, and all power placed in the hands of the President. Slowly but surely standards of living will fall, people become poor, and famine and pestilence spread abroad. Culture will wither and die as theatres close, book publishers fail, colleges decline, and churches become anemic. This is what we face, if we go to war. And people will call it a war to preserve democracy and save civilization!

THE SUPREME COURT AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

The 8 to 1 decision of the Supreme Court against Jehovah's Witnesses in the flag salute case was an impressive majority—but we nonetheless side with the minority as represented by a great judge, Mr. Justice Stone. The majority opinion, as written by Mr. Justice Frankfurter, laid emphasis on the American flag as "the symbol of our national unity, transcending differences, however large," and on the right of the state to determine "the appropriateness of various means to evoke that unifying sentiment without which there can ultimately be no liberties, civil or religious." As we read these words, our mind went wandering back to certain momentous episodes in the past which involved this same issue of religious liberty as over against the power of the state. One such episode was that of the Quakers, in their early days in England, when they refused to take off their hats in the presence of the king and his lords, exactly as Jehovah's Witnesses refuse to salute the flag, and on identically the same ground—namely, that they could give homage to none other than God alone. Against these Quakers was invoked the same principle that our Supreme Court has now invoked against this latest minority sect—that the king was "the symbol of national unity, transcending all differences" and rightly exacting salutation. In the name of this principle the Quakers were terribly punished; but they stuck it out, and history has justified them. Another such episode is that of the early Christians who refused to worship, or even acknowledge, the emperor. All that was asked of them was that they put a pinch of salt on the emperor's altar, as all that is asked of Jehovah's Witnesses is that they raise the right hand in salute to the flag. But these early Christians would not do this—and history has declared that they were nobly and heroically vindicating the cause of spiritual freedom. Mr. Justice Stone is right—this majority opinion of the Court coerces a sincere group of men and women to a practice which violates their deepest religious convictions. It is thus "no more than the surrender of the constitutional protection of the liberty of small minorities to the popular will." We profoundly regret this decision. Nevertheless, may we add, we are not going to advocate the packing of the Court. We believe in taking things as they come—and fighting on!

WHAT HAS BECOME OF CHARACTER?

These are some of the things that are going on today! * * * In New York City, so many school children traveling daily on the subways use lead nickels in the automatic turnstiles that the situation has become a major problem duly submitted by the transportation authorities to the school authorities for inquiry and action. * * * On March 29th last, a new sick-leave policy went into effect in the New York Police Department, under which policemen on sick leave, instead of being without pay as hitherto, are given half-pay for the first three days of illness, and full pay thereafter. Within less than three weeks, there was an increase of more than 50 per cent in the number of policemen on sick leave. * * * In a Maine town, populated by "good old New England stock," a summer cottage was burned to the ground in March. Investigation uncovered eight or ten boys and girls, sixteen to nineteen years of age, members of highly reputable families, who had broken and entered into a dozen or more cottages during the winter, used them for drinking and petting parties, stolen from them goods of value, and wantonly smashed furniture and decorations. * * * In Wayne (Detroit) County, Michigan, five high officials were arrested on charges that they had accepted money "not to enforce the law." The five officials included the County Prosecutor, the Sheriff, and three of their assistants. * * * A college girl, described as "very dependable," is quoted as stating that the college code sanctions sexual relations between couples contemplating marriage. "Nearly every girl in college has a device to protect herself"! * * * The New York *Herald-Tribune* publishes the following advertisement:

GHOSTWRITERS
BUREAU
The RIGHT word!
Any topic, any purpose, any length.
We write it—YOU sign it.

* * * Four boys, aged nine to thirteen years, wrecked six rooms of the Epiphany Parochial School in New York, so that school sessions had to be suspended. * * * A "murder syndicate" in Brooklyn, N. Y., is estimated to have taken more than fifty lives in cold blood and for pay; one member of the gang has confessed to six victims killed with his own hand. * * * Gambling has become in recent years a mania of incredible proportions. The money won and lost on horse races, dog races, lotteries, and "bingo" games totals unnumbered millions. And states and cities legislate for their "cut" of the swag! * * * What has become of character? What are our schools and churches and families doing that such things can be?

The Jewish Nightmare in Palestine

W. RUPERT HOLLOWAY

I

An article in a recent issue of *The Christian Commonwealth,* entitled "Jew and Arab in Palestine," states that during the last few months Arab-Jewish relations have been good in Palestine; that not only has Arab violence ceased, neighborliness has prevailed for the first time in four years, a happy state brought about by a common attitude of opposition to Naziism.

The article, recording that Arabs and Jews had pledged their full support to the Allies, states that this new-found peace has become suddenly endangered by the promulgation of Land Regulations, prohibiting sales by Arabs to Jews in certain areas. The writer asks why such an "inequitable and ill-timed" bombshell is hurled into the painfully acquired harmony of Palestine, and why a Christian nation denies the Jew.

The answer is, that Imperialism recognizes no Jewish rights in Palestine. The British mandatory, as is shown by its history since the last war, has played the imperialistic game realistically, the only check being an occasional flare-up of public opinion in England and America. Let us look at the record.

The present war may change the policy, yet, as we have already stated, Arab and Jew are again being set off one against the other. The prohibition of land sales is an old story. Every obstacle has been placed in the path of Zionists. That they have survived is a tribute to their indomitable perseverance, as much as a recognition of their terrible need for a homeland.

Last May, Great Britain decided to stop, after 1944, further Jewish immigration into Palestine; 175,000 Palestinian Jews staged a protest, registered a determination to resist the decree by every means in their power. They had been assured during and after the Great War by all the liberal forces of Europe and America (with the expressed good will of Arabs and Turks) that they were to regain possession of their ancestral land. The decree was protested also by liberal Americans, led by Louis Brandeis, who won a pledge from our Secretary of State that he would exercise "all necessary measures for protection of American rights in Palestine"; a reminder that America had viewed the British Mandate as the means of establishing the Jews as a nation, and had concurred in it only for that reason. The decision of the British government sooner or later to establish Palestine as an independent Arab state was clearly an illegal and unethical act.

II

When Lord Balfour and the imperialists in 1917 agreed to the establishment of a Jewish national home, it was at a price, the price of money and men contributed by the Jewish people everywhere to the Allied cause. That was at the darkest hour, when victory was uncertain. The French Government committed itself to the project. President Wilson wrote that "the Allied nations, with the fullest concurrence of our own Government and people, are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish commonwealth." Lloyd George plainly expressed the intention of his government to help Jewry "to realize its age-long aspirations" to regain its ancient national home. Colonial Secretary Ormsby-Gore had no doubt of it; telling the Jews that "you are bound together in Palestine by the need of building up a Jewish nation in all its various aspects, a national center for Jewry all over the world to look at." It is obvious why the Balfour Declaration was called the Magna Carta of Judaism. The ruling Turks had been driven out; the stage was set for wholesale colonization. Why has the dream become a nightmare?

The Arabs numbered half a million in 1914, the Jews 100,000; neither had any voice in the government. The Sultan of Turkey had been willing to sell Palestine to the Zionists for ten million dollars; the money was not available. Throughout Arabia the chiefs were in favor of Zionist plans; in Palestine the peasantry were delighted at every prospect of Jewish colonization near their villages, for the benefits it brought. Those elements of the Arabs who wanted a new Arab renaissance regarded a Jewish Palestine as the necessary foundation for a greater Arabia. In 1919 there was close coöperation between Zionists and the Arab Nationalist movement; a convention was signed providing for the closest possible collaboration in the development of the Arab state and the coming Jewish commonwealth of Palestine. The Arabs, in return for economic help rendered by the Zionists, agreed to facilitate the carrying into effect of the Balfour Declaration, to encourage immigration of Jews on a large scale.

Unfortunately, a fear on the part of non-Zionist Jews who imagined they might have to emigrate to Palestine had led to the insertion of a clause in the Balfour Declaration that nothing should be done in establishing the Palestinian home which might prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country. As we look over the European scene of the last few years, there is something pathetic in this attempt to safeguard civil rights which were destroyed wholesale for different reasons. We note it here because the inserted clause became an excuse by certain British interests to sabotage Zionist hopes.

III

The main obstacle, it is clear, from the beginning was not Arab opposition. Immediately the war ended, a British military administration opposed Zionism, considering the Jews to be dangerous Bolsheviks conspiring against the empire; these militarists wished a British colony excluding Jews, and the Balfour Declaration was regarded by them as nonsense. It was they who first fostered hostility between Arab and Jew, prohibited sales of land, and curbed immigration. A Jewish commission, coming from London in July, 1918, equipped with the authority of the British government, to advise the Palestine Administration on Jewish Affairs, was ignored by the military together. The military imperialists were working for one big Arab state including Palestine, with an Arab king as a puppet of Britain. (This was prior to the official action of the League of Nations that conferred the Mandatory on Britain.) The native population in Jerusalem was incited to riot against the Jews; the latter, when they defended themselves, were imprisoned.

But all the blame for the failure of Zionist hopes

does not lie at the door of imperialism. At the Peace Conference in 1919, Zionism could have got what it needed. It could have demanded the immediate establishment of a complete and purely Jewish state in Palestine. Lloyd George said that Weizmann, the Jewish spokesman, was the only modest man at the Conference; he wanted the Arabs to get a square deal! The Jews believed in English honesty and good faith, asked themselves for the appointment of Britain as the mandatory. The League Council so decided, with the plain understanding that immigration was to be facilitated, and the Jews settled on the land. America in 1924 became one of the contracting parties to this international arrangement.

That got rid of the military administration in Palestine, but the British Colonial Office then took control, and the officials were used to playing factions expertly off against each other. Another pogrom occurred, and the blame was ascribed to Jewish Bolsheviks! In June, 1922, the Churchill White Paper reinterpreted the Balfour Declaration to mean, not a Jewish state but only an improvement in the economic position of the Jews in Palestine. The country was split in two, the eastern part handed over to the Arabs as a puppet state (Jews excluded)—a direct nullification of the Mandate.

The pogrom of 1929 was the worst. Tagore urged a united fight on Britain by all the oppressed nations, charging her with perpetuating a state of war between Arab and Jew. The League's Mandates Commission said the British government was sabotaging the Jewish national home. The whole Jewish community in protesting the massacre, laid the cause of it directly at the door of British officialism. Administering Palestine were officials who did not like Zionism at all, and the usual whitewashing was done by a Commission of Inquiry. The Zionists, it now appeared, had robbed the innocent Arabs of land, and the remedy again was to curtail Jewish immigration and land purchase. The plain fact, said Lord Snell, a dissenting voice on the Inquiry, was that Jewish activities had increased prosperity and raised the standard of the Arab worker; that wide tracts of land were lying waste, available for the Jews. Lloyd George also made mincemeat of the Shaw Commission's report, stating that a competent survey under his Premiership in 1919 had shown that, by well-planned schemes of irrigation, a million acres could be added to the cultivatable area of Palestine, providing maintenance for sixteen times the number then on the land.

Whitehall secured another commission report in 1930 testifying there was not enough land to go round. The Jews must not buy, immigration must stop! But there occurred at that time a dramatic event which showed that bureaucracy does not represent public opinion in Britain. It was only the forbearance of the Jews that saved the British government from a drastic beating in Parliament. The bureaucracy countered with an infamous Palestine development scheme, which developed nothing.

There is evidence that later the Nazis and Fascists got into the game, using the same inside propagandistic methods as in European democracies. *Mein Kampf* is a best seller among Arabs. Mussolini is active in the Mohammedan world. The dictators supplied arms to the Arab feudal and reactionary forces to terrorize the common people in Palestine who wanted better conditions.

The whole story of Zionism reeks with Near East intrigue, and the conflict of imperialistic forces. This is a sordid story of dirty politics, only to be understood if you understand power-politics and the meaning of imperialism. The Zionists never had a chance, but what they accomplished in spite of obstacles is a record of amazing achievement.

IV

What are the internal problems? You have heard the nonsense that Jews are not farmers. Palestine when the Jews occupied it centuries ago was a land flowing with milk and honey,—in other words, a prosperous farming community. The Zionists began to show the Arabs how to cultivate. What the immigrants, a lot of them with college degrees, found in the Holy Land was the native Jews, very ignorant of farming, mostly townspeople or pilgrims; and an Arab peasant class ground under the feet of feudal landowners who were bleeding the poor as badly as Indian peasants were ground under. From 1914 to the present time, the Jewish population grew from 100,000 to over 400,000; and $400,000,000 were invested in the land—private and public investments. The Arab population in that time nearly doubled owing to the better conditions created by the Jews. Today, the wages paid to labor in Palestine where the Zionists dwell are two or three times higher than those paid in Syria or Egypt. The Jews taught the Arabs better agriculture; they taught them to revolt against high taxes; they gave them a better idea of life. Higher standards of living and higher wages for the masses did not suit the feudal lords, nor did the freedom displayed by Jewish women satisfy the Mohammedan priests. In other words, there was a certain amount of opposition to the Jews because they were enlightened and brought into Palestine the benefits of science. Moreover the Jews, when they got into the government service, worked hard to improve conditions, which did not please the young Arabs of rich families who wanted only soft jobs. There was the usual resentment against the foreign religion and against the stranger, such as occurs in any similar situation. There was also the conflict created by the after-war division of the spoils; for, as it turned out, the British had promised the Arabs, or the Arabs thought they had, possession and control of Palestine. There is also the mess created by the British government having two contrary attitudes—one group of the English favoring coöperation with the Jews, and another section wishing coöperation with the Arabs, each section playing off against the other and getting things balled up. Hence the curious dualism in Palestine—the cultivation of pogroms on the one hand, and, on the other, attempts to suppress the Arabs—both conducted by the British as part of an imperialistic policy. The result has been, and will always be, that neither Jews nor Arabs get a square deal, or are brought together in mutual tolerance and understanding.

Chamberlain took a hand, trying more of his famous appeasement policy—appeasing the Arabs at the expense of the Jews. The Zionists have been willing to see erected not a purely Jewish state, with Zionist control, but a Bi-National State, neither Arabs nor Jews to dominate either culturally or financially. The left-wing Zionists say, however, that they cannot coöperate with the Arab feudal class, and that there is no solution of the land problem, or any just settlement, until the big estates are divided up, and land given or sold to the people willing to cultivate it, on scientific principles. They say the trouble is with the present economic

domination by feudal Arabs; that there must be a modern system of labor legislation and also the establishment of facilities for easy credit—the same sort of thing American farmers want.

V

That the Jews since the war have made immense contributions in Palestine there can be no doubt. The land they bought was mostly unsettled and uncultivated, a lot of it swamp or desert areas—all of it paid for, and none expropriated, at prices sometimes exorbitant. The Jewish pioneers irrigated and drained this land, getting rid of the malaria-infested swamps. When the charge was made in 1929 that Arab farmers had been displaced, the total number was found to be only 550, of whom some had gone to the cities and others to new land. The myth of the landless Arab was invented for political reasons.

Since April, 1936, the pioneers of the Jewish Home have had to face terrorism unflinchingly: they have been shot at, bombs have been thrown at their schoolhouses, crops set on fire, and forests planted by them for erosion put to the flames. Yet in spite of these attacks they have not retaliated, they have adopted a policy merely of defense. It has been their objective to cultivate friendly relations with the Arabs.

The conclusion to be drawn from this sombre chronicle of events is that no people can get justice in this world while the rival imperialisms struggle for power. The Jewish dream of a national home was not wrecked by the people of England, who have never been anti-Semitic; it was sabotaged by the powers that had axes to grind, by those who deliberately excited Arab suspicion and resentment. In the second place, the exploiting Arab class in Palestine found their privileges to be jeopardized by the enlightened spirit of the pioneer Jews. In the third place, the Jews themselves never had a united front and did not take advantage of the opportunity that was theirs after the war.

Probably the greatest mistake the Zionists made was in asking the other powers to give Britain the mandate, for Palestine in the eyes of British imperialists is too implicated in eastern politics and the struggle for power. The most important commitment in the Mandate was Article II which stated that "the Mandatory shall be responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish National Home as laid down in the Preamble." This was the duty, the obligation, of the government that accepted the mandate; but Britain never lived up to it; and today has put the Palestinian Jews in a terrible plight. On a previous occasion, when injustice prevailed, and the Zionists were being defrauded of their rights, a wave of indignation swept the world. Our duty today as Americans is to express our indignation at this crass betrayal of a people in the interests of Empire, to ask the administration at Washington to inform the British government that the terms of the Mandate are being wilfully destroyed, and to repair the wrong before it is too late. For the only solution to Jewish misery that we can see in the world today, as the poison of hate saturates the earth, is the setting up of a Jewish homeland, a national haven into which they may freely move, and to provide for as many of them as possible the rights of nationalism. Unfortunately, the war is on!

Toward Clarification of Thought on the War Situation

CURTIS W. REESE

Since the daily press rather widely and somewhat erroneously reported my presidential address before the recent annual meeting of the Adult Education Council of Chicago, I desire to make known to readers of UNITY precisely what I said on that occasion. The first four-fifths of my address consisted of material in an article of mine published in UNITY, November 20, under the title, "The Need for Clear Thinking on the Question of War." The fifth section of the address was as follows:

Increasingly we face the problem of at least a "limited participation," which no doubt will carry us beyond the bounds of official neutrality. Since the world in which we live is one where material force in the form of war periodically visits its devastation upon us, and since mankind's lack of social intelligence, as evidenced in the failure to outlaw war and establish ordered liberty, leaves us with tragically limited alternatives, we now face a situation where democratic values and human integrity require that we participate in opposition to the Nazi philosophy and program of aggression and expansion. The immediate question has to do with the most effective limited participation.

There seems to be no doubt but that American opinion favors the Allies; and well it may, for a victory for Nazi Germany would close the door of Europe to democratic progress for generations, if not centuries. Such an eventuality is of concern to us apart from any danger to our shores. We have not yet, I trust, lost the ideal of the responsible exercise of power with due regard for constitutionally guaranteed liberties in contrast with the arbitrary exercise of power without regard for any liberties. International liberty under law is of concern to America, and we will not see that ideal crushed along with the lives of those who defend it, without ourselves marshalling at least the moral and material strength of this great nation on the side of those who defend the way of progressive civilization, which we call democracy.

I do not at this stage assume to know just the limit of our needed participation. The manner and the extent of our aid is a problem calling for calm statesmanship and scientific precision, not for partisan politics and panicky confusion. But I should say that the minimum participation called for is the speedy making available of such needed material as our highly geared technology can produce.

As educators we can in these days of stress help keep the mind of America as calm and the soul of America as tolerant, as determined and effective action will permit. As educators we can make it plain that no nation liveth unto itself alone—that by a thousand ties we are enmeshed in world affairs and could not, even if we would, divest ourselves of world responsibility. As educators we can help the people to think rigorously and consistently, so that our common action may be both sane and effective.

War: Causes and Cures

VICTOR S. YARROS

Generalizations about human nature are of dubious validity. When Freud asserted that man is naturally aggressive and predatory, and that therefore war is, under circumstances, unavoidable, many of us—humanists, pacifists, progressives, meliorists—shook our heads. Man, we remembered, was also a social and political animal. Man coöperates in a hundred ways and mutual aid is as characteristic of him as combativeness and selfishness.

Man is rational, and he is also irrational. He believes in reason, and is proud of his science and his philosophy. But at times he obeys certain drives and urges which reason would condemn if it had a chance to restrain him.

Libraries are full of books about war, its causes, preventives and possible "moral equivalents." Perhaps there is little to be added to what has been thought and said on that tragic problem. But the present world situation tempts one to restudy the subject. Leaving deduction on one side, let us ask, in the light of comparatively recent experience, the old familiar question: Why do nations fight? Why have we failed to extend to the field of international relations the reign of law, which, despite limitations and exceptions, we have found indispensable *within* organized states and countries? It has been said that one nation can start a world war, while many nations must will and labor to insure peace. Any nation can start a war because of the accepted doctrine of national sovereignty. That doctrine, in the words of Professor Dewey, is a doctrine of anarchy.

Take first the United States. Here is a favored country, a "have" country, with an abundance of natural and human resources, with vast spaces and an energetic, industrious population, and with what we call free institutions. Has this fortunate nation enjoyed peace; has it managed to deal with its problems rationally; has it, in a word, succeeded in escaping the miseries, horrors, and appalling wastes of war? *It has not!* Why not? What were the causes of *its* several wars?

The war of the Revolution—as even England now admits—was inevitable because of the arrogance, obstinacy, and stupidity of the British rulers and statesmen of the time. The American colonists had serious grievances, and a policy of conciliation and reasonable concessions would have delayed independence for a long time. Even the eloquence of Burke made no impression on the blind Tories. Resort to force was natural in the circumstances. Canada would rebel and fight the mother country today, if England had not learned its lesson and granted its principal colonies home rule and virtual equality in a Commonwealth of British Nations.

What caused the Civil War? Again, blindness, arrogance, fanaticism, and unwillingness to give and take under the compulsion of changing conditions. That war was unnecessary. Slavery would have been abolished by consent, and compensation would have been paid to the planters of the South, had reason and the spirit of mutualism prevailed.

What caused the war with Spain over Cuba? *That* war was wholly unnecessary. Yellow and unscrupulous journalism, mendacious atrocity stories of all sorts, unsupported charges about *The Maine* explosion, and McKinley's political opportunism and insincerity combined to cause that war.

Our entrance into the World War was undoubtedly caused by our financial stake in the victory of the Allies, our indignation against Germany and its ruthless submarine warfare, and our sympathies with England and France, whom we did not want to see beaten and bled white by a German junker-dictated peace. British propaganda, skillfully conducted here, was but a minor factor.

It should be added that nearly all our sober historians believe that our war with Mexico was unwarranted and unjust. We wanted Mexican territory and trumped up vague charges against that country. We were in an imperialistic phase of development and were aggressive and arrogant. "Manifest destiny" was a rhetorical slogan. Demagogues used it effectively.

So much, briefly, for America's wars. It is much more difficult to trace with any scientific exactitude the causes of old-world wars, past or present. Yet judicious historians agree that *many* of these wars might have been averted and the issues involved in them settled by negotiation and mutual concessions.

It is out of the question to discuss here many of the old-world wars. Space forbids any such attempt. But a sufficient number of such wars can be taken up and dealt with impartially, and the generalization or conclusion that will emerge will apply to many other wars, if not to all.

First, the World War. Was it unavoidable? That is not the opinion of scholars and objective thinkers. If the Austro-Hungarian government had accepted the Serbian answer to its harsh ultimatum, there would have been no war. It must be remembered that the German Kaiser himself wrote in a marginal note that the Serbian answer was quite satisfactory and that he was greatly relieved and reassured by it! Why was it rejected, and why was the Vienna government so precipitate and so intransigent? It wanted to humiliate and destroy Serbia, and it preferred war to peace at that critical juncture. It gambled and blundered; its responsible statesmen were reckless and stubborn.

Again, why did Germany give the Vienna government *carte blanche* at the time, instead of trying to restrain it, to warn it, to advise patience, prudence, and moderation? Germany "did not want the war," it said. No, perhaps not. But *it did not want peace badly enough to lift a finger to prevent war.* It was bound to have its way, war or no war, and war came.

Some Russian statesmen, too, preferred war to peace on certain terms. The Russian foreign minister, Isvolsky, spoke of *"my* war"—he had welcomed it, apparently, and had done nothing to promote a diplomatic settlement. Perhaps some French diplomats then in power were not averse to war; a war of *revanche*, a war to recover Alsace and Lorraine. The *people* did not want war; but they had no power and but little opportunity to shape the course of events.

The causes of the World War, then, were: the vanity, pride, ambition, folly, and blindness of statesmen clothed with brief authority! Particularly, of Austrian and German statesmen, who had contempt for the people.

The British-Boer war? Were not the noblest and best Englishmen—Morley, Bryce and many others—pro-Boer? Did they not oppose the Tory policy in South Africa, a policy of grab and domination by British adventurers and imperialists? The defeat of the Boers, fortunately, was not followed by the destruction of Boer autonomy. The Union of South Africa is today as free as Canada.

The Franco-Prussian war of 1870 resulted directly from Bismarck's "iron" diplomacy and statesmanship. It was aggressive and Machiavelian. The so-called Ems telegram, a characteristically tricky move in the game, was intended to provoke France and to start a war in the interest of German imperialism. German unity was to follow, and it did. In the same way, the war between Prussia and Austria of 1866 was planned and engineered by Bismarck for the purpose of weakening and humiliating Austria, and making Germany the first power in Central Europe.

Is it necessary to comment at any length on the Sino-Japanese war, the Italian invasion and conquest of Ethiopia, the annexation of Manchukuo by Japan, the invasion of Albania by Italy, the annexation of Austria, and the recent expansion of Nazi Germany?

None of these wars was *necessary* or morally defensible. They were wars of naked aggression and conquest. So far, they have not even paid "dividends." They may *never* be economically profitable to the predatory aggressors.

What shall be our conclusion, then, as to the fundamental and major causes of war? We cannot fail to recognize that these causes lie in the nature of kings, diplomats, dictators, statesmen, who are not essentially different from other men—*average* men of all classes and conditions. Only, most men wield no power. Those who possess power are certain to abuse it; power corrupts and demoralizes. In the words of Lord Acton, "absolute power demoralizes absolutely."

As long as individuals, or small cliques, have the power to make war, wars will be made. Ambition, vanity, false pride, envy, thirst for glory, the desire to aggrandize one's state at the expense of other states, the passion to tyrannize over others—these emotions will lead to war, and pretexts can always be found for the most criminal and inexcusable wars. In international relations, mendacity, falsehood, hypocrisy, and double-dealing have been the rule for centuries, or millennia, and the end is not yet.

To be sure, there have been schools of opinion, and there still are schools, which maintain that wars are "biologically" necessary and inevitable; that in war the fittest survive, and the unfit are eliminated or subdued and dominated for the good of the human race. Wars are declared to be "eugenic"; that is, the vigor of the race requires them, and peace would spell degeneration and decay. This gospel has been preached by militarists and by scientists alike. Man, we are told, owes his progress to fighting other men; "civilization travels on the powder cart," said Lowell.

It is, however, a fact that in recent years more and more of our scientific biologists—to say nothing of moralists and sociologists—have repudiated that gospel, and have argued that war is "anti-eugenic"—that it has ceased to be a test of real fitness. Mechanized warfare, poison gas, wholesale bombing from the air, massacring of women, children, the aged and sick have little relation to fitness. Besides, today money, not physical fitness, may bring victory. Countries that happen to have gold, or oil, or iron, rubber and copper, may be able to defeat countries that lack certain materials, or gold, or foreign exchange, despite their superiority in racial vigor, intelligence, and patriotism. It is safe to say that the biologists who oppose war have the better of the argument.

There is more to be said for the school—a growing one—which holds that wars are caused chiefly by *economic* factors—by the urgent material needs of some nations whom we now call "have-not" nations. Germany, Italy, and other nations now demand "room to live"; they want more territory, more fields of grain, more oil wells, more precious metals. They feel that the "have" nations owe their strength and wealth not to virtue, but to past aggression and conquest, and that they simply wish to keep what they have, regardless of any consideration of justice and fair play. Why should not the poor nations pursue the same policies which the rich and sated nations pursued in the past with success? They ask: Why a new deal today? Why a sudden conversion to morality in international relations?

The answer to this line of argument is not unfamiliar to thinking persons. The crimes and follies of the past do not justify new crimes and follies. A new deal, a new policy, in international relations would benefit *all* nations, because under modern conditions there are no victors in war. All participants lose; all should desire permanent peace, and all should make their appropriate contributions to the cause of peace. No nation will surrender territory or population, but all should strive to increase and extend foreign trade, and all should have access to raw materials and natural wealth on fair terms. Colonial policy can be modified and international coöperation substituted for exploitation by any one power. "Mandates" over colonies should be genuine mandates; the interests of the native population should be deemed paramount. Investment for development of untapped resources should be open to all nations desirous of sharing in such opportunities.

Professor John Dewey has been quoted above to the effect that among the major causes of war is the idea of national sovereignty—an idea, which is equivalent to that of *international anarchy*. Individuals, groups, minorities, and classes have been gradually but surely brought under the control of law and ethics. We do not permit members of any society to make war on their fellow members. We have not abolished crime, but we punish it and thus, perhaps, prevent it to a considerable extent. We subordinate—in theory at any rate—all special interests to the welfare of the whole society. Why should *nations* be permitted to flout all moral principles and all considerations of humanity, and attack other nations, with or without reason, merely because they expect to gain something by war? War *can* be outlawed, and *should* be. If pacts and leagues fail to accomplish this purpose, the explanation of the failures is to be sought not in the purpose, the idea, but in the ways, methods, and machinery thus far tried. Other means are available; experiments will suggest other and better experiments. The federal system has brought the United States peace and progress. Why should not Europe look forward to federation and all its economic and social advantages? Such federation would assure Europe peace and prosperity, and thus many of the causes of war in Europe would have been removed.

Finally, psychologists affirm that among the causes

of war are: the human dislike of drudgery, of disagreeable labor, of monotony and boredom, and the love of adventure, excitement, variety, and novelty. To many, war means relief from drabness and intolerable conditions of work and existence. But work should not be sheer and mere drudgery; and existence should always have sufficient variety and interest to render it more attractive and more desirable than escape into barbarism and moral irresponsibility.

To sum up: The causes of war are rooted in our imperfectly socialized nature. The criminal and semi-criminal elements wage war on society, and peace, order, and harmony within the most civilized societies are as yet only ideals. In international relations, the very idea of law and order is rather new. But it is a sound and realizable idea, provided we patiently ascertain and remove the major causes of war. We have almost got rid of religious wars, or of crusades. Tolerance is growing in that province. Economic causes of war remain; commercial conflicts and tariff walls are forms of warfare, and may lead to physical clashes. Free trade and federalism are undoubtedly prerequisites of peace, but when will mankind be ready to accept these principles and institutions? No one knows the answer. Progress toward those goals will be very slow, but we must work for that progress patiently and faithfully.

Again, democracy is less likely to rush into war than autocracy or dictatorship. Discussion at any rate prevents hasty and rash action. The people have been taught to demand information and discussion, though they do not always effectively enforce their demand and display too much patience. The right to knowledge and to the presentation of all sides of public issues of moment clearly needs additional guaranties and safeguards. The institutions and agencies designed to insure deliberation, to afford opportunity for conciliation and mediation, need implementation and increased authority. Even a declaration of war should not preclude criticism of the government and expressions of dissent. It is never too late to give sobriety and reason a chance to propose alternatives to brute force and savage violence.

Sweden's Government Subsidizes Peace!

DEVERE ALLEN*

Some time during the course of this legislative year, as in each year since 1929, the Swedish Riksdag will pass, probably without opposition, a bill authorizing a substantial grant of money to be divided among Swedish peace organizations. The lion's share of the grant will be separated, put under the budget of the Foreign Office, and go to the Information Bureau of "Mellanfolkligt Samarbete," or "International Cooperation." The founder of this information bureau on peace questions was C. J. Brunskog, who persuaded the Swedish Government that peace was so important to the welfare of Sweden and her people that active work to promote it should receive government subsidies.

This man, recently dead, was a Captain in the Swedish army. He served in the army during the last war, and as the war progressed, he became more and more convinced that it was going to accomplish nothing, and that war in general was a terrible and futile way of trying to settle international differences. But it was from another man that he caught the spark which finally crystallized his ideas and decided him to work actively for peace. This man was Doctor Natanael Beskow, one of the most beloved and respected men in Sweden today. Having left a post as minister of a wealthy parish in the suburbs of Stockholm to start a settlement house for workers in the city, Doctor Beskow decided to give expression to his pacifist ideas by founding, in 1918, the Swedish section of the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

Profoundly influenced by the breadth and sincerity of Doctor Beskow's ideas and labors, Captain Brunskog resigned from the army after the war and set to work to create what he felt was most needed in the struggle for peace—reliable, objective information on world affairs available to every man and woman in the country. His information bureau was not to be a propaganda agency for pacifism, but an organization working objectively to gather and disseminate facts on all topics having to do with international relations and world efforts for peace.

Almost at once Captain Brunskog and Doctor Beskow received the support and collaboration of many friends, among them Nathan Söderblom, then archbishop of Upsala, the world-famous author Selma Lagerlöf, Kersten Hesselgren, member of the First Chamber of the Riksdag, and of Osten Unden, then Minister of Foreign Affairs. Together they began agitating for Government support, but progress was slow. A Conservative Government was in power at the time, under the premiership of Admiral Lindman, and neither he nor his party looked favorably upon the "pacifists." But the rapidly rising Social Democrats, the Liberals, and some of the Farmer's Party members thought differently. For them anything that might help prevent the terrible weight of war from falling again upon the shoulders of the working people was worth supporting, and so, in 1929, a bill to authorize a grant was brought upon the floor by a young Social Democrat, Johan Nilsson. Bitterly contested by the conservatives, the bill might have been defeated but for the sympathetic backing of the speaker of the Second Chamber, Mr. Sevström, who was also a Social Democrat. After heated debates, it was passed, and a grant of twenty-five thousand crowns was authorized.

Every year since then the grant has been renewed, at first reluctantly, but in the last five years without opposition. In lean years it has shrunk to as little as fifteen thousand crowns, and in the better years it has reached thirty and thirty-two thousand crowns ($7,650). About a third of the money goes to the Information Bureau, the rest being divided among the other peace organizations of the country. But the firm support of the Bureau's early backer, the Foreign Minister Unden, has left its mark, for the money earmarked for the Bureau is put under the Foreign Office budget, separated from the rest, and from the very beginning the Bureau has worked hand in hand with the Foreign Office, sending over the information it re-

*Editor, *Nofrontier News Service.*

ceived, and receiving in return a daily summary of world news from the Office.

Jubilant over the victory in the Riksdag, Captain Brunskog at once got the Bureau started, with Doctor Beskow as chairman, and with himself as secretary. They started in at once to build up their own sources of information (including the *Nofrontier News Service*) and soon were issuing a weekly news release to the Swedish press. Today this release goes to more than forty papers, scattered over the whole of the country, the papers paying between fifty and a hundred crowns ($12 to $24) a year for the service. At the same time the organizers began putting out brochures from time to time on special topics dealing with international affairs. These brochures are studies made by specialists in the fields covered, and are most comprehensive in scope. Recent ones issued deal with the development of Swedish Foreign policy since the war, the armament policy of the United States, economic conditions in the USSR, and so on. Since 1931 the Bureau has also been issuing a monthly review entitled *Mellanfolkligt Samarbete*. With about thirty pages to each issue, the review contains general and specialized articles by well-known authorities on international relations, economics, and social problems.

A well-stocked library has been started by the Bureau and is now in constant use by students from all over the world, who may here consult all the latest publications from Geneva. The staff of the library is always at the disposal of the students for assistance in research work.

But both Captain Brunskog and Doctor Beskow conceived of their information bureau as something more than just an aid to a relatively small group of students who could afford the expense of scholarly research. They wanted to reach the working people of the country, the great masses of men and women who had always had to do the fighting and bear the suffering of wars without knowing what had caused them or why they were fighting in them. Most of these people could not come to the Bureau—the Bureau must go to them, making easily available to them the results of the work it had been doing, stimulating them to think about the problems it laid bare.

To accomplish this the Bureau joined hands with the already organized "Worker's Education Association," founded in 1912 by Rickard Sandler, recently resigned Foreign Minister. This association had been organizing study circles and courses of lectures in the small towns, in the country, everywhere where groups of workers could come together to discuss under the leadership of an experienced teacher the subjects and problems that interested them. Last year no fewer than eighty thousand Swedish working people benefited by this organization.

In close coöperation, the Information Bureau began organizing courses of lectures and outlines for study groups, finding the right men to lead them, and sending them out to the people. The effort has met with great success. Year by year the number of demands for study group discussions of foreign affairs topics has increased, and today the leaders of the Bureau have the satisfaction of knowing that in no small measure their efforts have contributed to making the Swedish people about the most intellectually awake and well-informed on matters of international relations in the world.

In the difficult days through which Sweden is passing at present, the Government may well congratulate itself on its support of this organization. Placed in a position where cold thinking must deny the natural emotional reactions of the common man, the Government is finding that in treading this difficult path it has the enlightened and understanding backing of the great mass of the people, who fortunately for Sweden have learned to think. For its continued existence, the Information Bureau needs no better justification. And what would happen in other countries if government funds were used, as in Sweden, even in small measure, for the undictated use of peace societies?

A Peace Offensive

LOLA MAVERICK LLOYD

We protest against the helpless drift of the Administration toward war—millions and billions for military defense and nothing at all for non-military efforts to bring the world to peace.

A real democracy may not be the best form of government to wage a war. Granted. But, by its very nature, democracy has a great advantage over autocracy. Its essential superiority is its expert experience in peacemaking. Its activities at home consist in arranging, legislating, arbitrating, compromising—in research and report and litigation—anything but military domination of its citizens. Democracies are equipped to put reasonable methods into motion internationally, the same methods evolved and perfected at home. They can publish and repeat their demands and offers of help to the maddened warriors. And in their human efforts they can afford failure after failure since their prestige does not hang on the prestige of their high officials. Democracy's prestige is something deeper rooted. To us the spectacle of a military struggle to the death seems insanely unnecessary. We who have to "get along" with all kinds of citizens are conditioned to be the peacemakers of the world.

Why are not Americans bending our thoughts this way? Has Washington entirely abandoned hope, and, if so, why? What secret efforts has the President made for peace so far? And, if he has made genuine efforts, why keep them secret from us? The people of this country will support honest attempts if they only know about them. We do know that President Roosevelt's public addresses to European nations in the last year have not sounded conciliatory. As *The American White Paper* elaborately explains, they have been a form of "offensive." Its authors, Alsop and Kintner, wrongly dub them "peace offensives." More accurately they were "offensives short of war."

A peace offensive could not be a partisan judgment, a scolding, an implied threat of war. It would have to be a bold foray against the spiritual stronghold of the whole fear-ridden military mind—an expression of a calm and determined purpose to hear complaints, compose differences and substitute reasonable machinery in

the international world for the outworn arbitrament of bloody war.

Such a peace offensive is not yet impossible. There may not be time now for the thorough conferring together of the neutrals which might have occurred last year. With neutral after neutral being swallowed up by war or military occupation, a quick peace offensive even now can be organized by the Americas and joined in by all of the remaining neutrals in other continents; first—a clear, sane, honest demand openly directed to the belligerents to end the fighting where they stand, with neutrals to settle their lines of temporary demarcation (without, of course, recognizing the permanent validity of military victory); second, a solemn pledge to suspend our own military preparations meanwhile; and, third, the offer of an honorable face-saving alternative to further war, consisting in the foundation of a world union inaugurated under neutral auspices by a world-wide Constitutional Convention. If rebuffed at first, neutrals can proceed to organize a preliminary constituent assembly of their own to lay the foundation for civilized international life. The sincerity of their efforts for armistice and the realism of their active procedure will penetrate to all the warring peoples and undermine their "will to war."

A peace offensive requires imagination and courage, but not so many millions of dollars. President Roosevelt has money for emergency use and can start a real peace offensive without further delay.

On the Pacifist Front

[UNITY will publish from time to time, under this heading, such news as can be gathered about pacifists and pacifist activities in these war days. We earnestly invite our readers to send us such items of interest as may come to their attention.—*Editor.*]

XVII

The New York *Times* announces the following:

> Details for waging a "Crusade of Prayer for Peace" at St. Patrick's Cathedral have been announced by the Reverend Joseph F. Flannelly, the Administrator, in his letter to the parishioners in the June issue of the *Cathedral Bulletin.* The crusade was launched on Friday, which was the Feast of the Sacred Heart of Jesus.
>
> "Each weekday during the month prayers to the Sacred Heart will be offered after the 12:15 mass and on Sundays they will be offered after vespers," Father Flannelly wrote.

The United Press carries the following dispatch from San Francisco:

> The National Legion of Mothers of America contemplates no "mothers' rifle corps" to shoot parachute troops and Fifth Columnists, Kathleen Norris, novelist, President of the Legion, said today.
>
> Mrs. Edna Johnston, a member of the Legion, has announced that 10,000,000 mothers would be organized to shoot enemy parachutists if the country were invaded.
>
> "We are not planning to take up arms," Mrs. Norris said. "Ours is a peace organization and we not only do not propose to shoulder arms, but we hope to influence all the nations of the world, some day, to settle their quarrels elsewhere than over the bodies of our sons."

A special dispatch in the New York *Times* from Philadelphia states the following:

> Judge Edwin O. Lewis of Common Pleas Court, addressing the graduating class of the Moore Institute and Philadelphia School of Design today, asked why college commencements should be "made the forum for the advocacy of war. We should make every resolve," he said, "to keep out of the war, but, if we desire, aid the Allies in other ways. . . ."

At its Anniversary meetings in Boston, on May 23rd last, the American Unitarian Association passed two important resolutions on the war question—one recognizing the right of individuals to be conscientious objectors to war, and the other providing for the official registration of Unitarians who are conscientious objectors. Unitarians thus align themselves with Quakers, Mennonites, Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, Lutherans, and other religious bodies in sustaining the inalienable spiritual right of conscientious objection to war.

On Memorial Day, in Washington, a peace petition signed by 10,000 mothers of New York was presented to Representatives Bloom and Barton, of that city. The mothers were all residents of the Congressional districts represented by these Congressmen. The petition opposed any participation by this country in the war abroad. Mr. Bloom, in receiving the petition, said, according to a special dispatch in the New York *Times,* that the signers "need have no fear that Congress would authorize any armed participation in the war."

An Anti-War Mobilization Meeting in Washington, D. C., held under the auspices of the National Council for the Prevention of War, the War Resisters League, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the New History Society, and World Peaceways, was attended by more than 300 delegates from 19 states. This meeting passed resolutions opposing American "intervention" in the European war.

At a mass meeting, Senator Burton K. Wheeler said, as reported by the New York *Times,* that "a mad hysteria today grips many of our people," and warned that the cause of democracy would be lost, not served, if the United States entered the war. He said further:

> We are told that Europe is on fire—that we should help put out this fire before the wind shifts and the fire reaches us. I want to do everything possible to help put out that fire.
>
> I want to do everything to help the Allies stamp out the brutal forces which seek to dominate Europe and perhaps the world. But by setting the United States on fire we will not help put out the fire in Europe. . . .
>
> Bearing in mind that we are presently engaged in a mad race to re-arm our own country and bolster our own national defenses, it may seem inconsistent to some that we should be shipping out of the country these munitions. I would have no objection, but we should be careful not to take steps which could involve this country in war.

We quote from the *Catholic Worker,* New York, the following remarkable editorial:

> Instead of gearing ourselves in this country for a gigantic production of death-dealing bombers and men trained to kill, we should be producing food, medical supplies, ambulances, doctors, and nurses for the works of mercy, to heal and rebuild a shattered world. Already there is famine in China. And we are still curtailing production in agriculture, thinking in terms of "price," instead of human needs. We do not take care of our own unemployed and hungry millions in city and country, let alone those beyond the seas. There is prejudice in our own country towards Jews, Negroes,

Mexicans, Filipinos, and others, a sin crying to Heaven for punishment.

"And if we are invaded?" is another question asked. We say again that we are opposed to all but the use of non-violent means to resist such an invader.

At a meeting of the *Catholic Worker* when Maritain spoke a few weeks ago, the question was asked: "What other means are there besides the use of an even greater force than that of the enemy?" Mrs. de Bethune, who has a son in Belgium and a daughter with two small babies in Holland, spoke up from where she was sitting: "Prayer and penance," she said, recalling what to all should have first come to mind. There had been little mention of it made that evening.

During the Franco-Prussian war, Bernadotte considered the Prussians the servants of God. When the Maccabees were being slain, one by one, in defense of their faith, they each testified that they were suffering for the sins of their race. How many Christians think of Hitler or Stalin in this way, as the "servant of God"? Do they remember them as temples of the Holy Ghost, creatures made to the image and likeness of God, two human beings for whom Christ died on the Cross? Are they praying for them—with love and pity?

We are urging what is a seeming impossibility—a training to the use of non-violent means of opposing injustice, servitude and a deprivation of the means of holding fast to the Faith. It is again the Folly of the Cross. But how else is the Word of God to be kept alive in the world. That Word is Love, and we are bidden to love God and to love one another. It is the whole law, it is all of life. Nothing else matters. Can we do this best in the midst of such horror as has been going on these past months by killing, or by offering our lives for our brothers?

It is hard to write so in times like these when millions are doing what they consider their duty, what is "good" for them to do. But if the Catholic press does not uphold the better way, the counsels of perfection will be lost to the world.

There are many who consider that we are approaching the end of the world, but what are two thousand years in the history of the world? We are still in the beginnings of Christianity. It is true that we are at the end of an era. and we are probably seeing the death throes of capitalism.

"Just as slavery was only put down after hundreds of years of labor by Christian men, so war will never be done away with, or even limited, but by an army of Peace workers who never cease their labors."

The following is quoted from a public statement of the Spiritual Community of Christ (the Doukhobors), of British Columbia, Canada:

. . . We state to you and to all representatives and rulers of kingdoms and empires, that we seriously reckon with the present world chaos (bloody struggle of all peoples) and find that mankind in general is heading for the worse and not for the better. And only because it has not heeded the voice of the great teacher—Christ, who called everybody to establish the kingdom of God on earth. We openly declare that we cannot remain silent in these dark days of inhumanity, bloodshed, and suffering. We speak with the experience of our ancestors and true teachers of all ages, that man must first heed the voice of God, and not the dictates of perverted human conceptions.

Moreover, we have found it erroneous to blame one or the other for today's world disorder. Some say Hitler is the cause; others point at Stalin. The third accuse Chamberlain. We categorically state, that all state political systems and their representatives together march and violate the supreme divine law: "Thou shalt not kill," and further develop false systems of social order.

In our life course we found that no political labels carry beneficial intentions. We do not idealize any political platforms, because they are inhuman, including the socialistic. As an example, our brethren (Doukhobors) and thousands of other pacifists and good people in Russia are leading peaceful lives, but the so-called socialists—bolsheviks unceasingly persecuted, and now are persecuting them, and as a matter of fact threw them and our leader into prisons and exile.

Here in democratic Canada, the assassination of Doukhobor leader and president of the Christian Community of Universal Brotherhood, Ltd., P. W. Verigin (in the year 1924), and the frequent imprisonment by Canadian authorities of our late leader, P. P. Verigin, clearly reveal the aim and policy of materialist-militarists to extinguish the spirit and teachings of Jesus Christ.

Therefore, on the above stated historical basis, we refuse to support all violent (murderous) systems, for the Scripture says that no murderer has the life eternal abiding in him. On this foundation we renounce militarism regardless by whom demanded or propounded: monarchists, fascists, socialists, or democrats. The prophet Isaiah long ago called humanity to beat swords and spears into plowshares and pruning-hooks. But humanity today has reached full insanity and does exactly the opposite: forges plows into cannon and swords.

In consequence, we conclusively have decided to forever remain on the path which Christ has shown us, and we are ready to accept whatever trials shall meet us on the way.

We are not striving against any separate individuals or parties. As Apostle Paul has said: "We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places," Eph. 6:12. We likewise call on you, Mr. McDonald, and all other brothers and peoples of all nations, and especially we exhort all present leaders of authority: Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin, Chamberlain, Reynaud, Pope Pius, the Mikado, President Roosevelt and all others: Repent! Stop spilling human blood! Dismiss the soldiers from the ranks! Liberate mother earth from slavery and exploitation—commercialism! Let be for all one slogan—toil and peaceful life!

The New York *Herald-Tribune* publishes the following news story:

The Convent of Mary Reparatrix, 14 East Twenty-ninth Street, will hold a public novena at St. Leo's Roman Catholic Church, 9 East Twenty-eighth Street, "to achieve what all the big minds of the world have tried, but failed, to achieve—to bring an end to war, to achieve a speedy, a just, a lasting peace."

In the announcement of the novena, which will open with a solemn high mass at St. Leo's, it was said that "prayer, united prayer, confident prayer, prayer fortified by reparation, is the only remaining weapon for peace." The novena was described as a "challenge of our loyalty to the Holy Father, and of our faith in the power of prayer and reparation to achieve the impossible."

The Southern Baptist Convention, meeting in Baltimore, Maryland, took action appealing to the President to do everything in his power to keep this country out of war.

The Infinite

From the infinite ages we come,
To the infinite ages we go;
Of the infinite meaning of things
An infinite little we know.

Yet here in the midst of it all
With an infinite sureness are we;
In the infinite oneness of things
We always have been and shall be.

With an infinite hunger within us
An infinite beauty we find;
The infinite joy of beholding
Brings infinite growth of our mind.

With an infinite wonder we wonder
As we gaze at the infinite sky;
An infinite goodness there must be
Though we know not the whence or the why.

By an infinite Love are we nourished—
A love that can know no surcease,
And glad with an infinite gladness
We are filled with an infinite peace!

VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH.

The Study Table

The Duty Not to Conform

SCYLLA THE BEAUTIFUL. *By Albert and Helen Fowler. Hamilton, N. Y.: The Republican Press.*
THE SHRINE OF BEAUTY. *By Mary A. Hurd. Boston: Chapman & Grimes.*
PAINTER'S PALETTE. *By Charles Joseph Rider. Emory University (Atlanta), Georgia: Banner Press.*
STAR BEYOND SHADOW. *By Sibyl Pommer. Banner Press.*
ADJUSTMENT TO JESUS. *By Lawrence W. Neff. Banner Press.*

> "Though we are dead we cannot die.
> Our children hold us up too high . . .
> Worship the things we used to know,
> Our prejudices row on row,"

declare the dead in Scylla . . . and the living might well echo them in this as in all else. Give us Charybdis! A strike fails—and a town, a class, a social order, and two characters fall. True, "Scylla grew more bountiful . . . most beautiful." Two rebels are brought "back into the social swim." Capitalism continues the bacchanalia of bourgeois banality. But we have seen on what it all now stands: heartbreak.

In sinewy free verse with brilliant, icy interstices of lyric and parody and tense drama, Albert and Helen Fowler tell the story of a strike and its repercussions while with powerful drawings Lee Brown Coye shows us Scylla and the thousands of towns of which it is counterpart. A project I had long planned, the story of a strike in narrative poetry. No doubt they do it better —because they love and hate Scylla. But had I written it, the strike would have succeeded and the hero and heroine found themselves (as have many like them) in the invincible sweep of the labor movement, past any possibility of turning back into the living death of identification with anything less vital than their broadest vision. But a multitude of strikes await the singing.

Though *The Shrine of Beauty* is a shrine to the memory of its late author, a lovely shrine to a memory that should long endure, it is as timely as though it were now being written. Mary A. Hurd was a pacifist . . . what true poet is not? Sympathetic with the internal aspirations and achievements of Russia, she was a mystic as well as a rebel . . . and what true poet is not a builder of the bridge between the Social Frontier and the Spiritual Horizon? And like many another good social vision poet, she contributed to UNITY.

Painter's Palette frequently sparkles and always glows. "Your harmonies can conquer fear," Charles Joseph Rider assures his fellow poets, and his own work proves that poems can strike at the "wolfish greed for material things" while moving "to the buoyant lilt of a traveler's song." Though profound when he sings of "rhythms which God in creation drew," we rejoice in his work most when he looses shafts of lyric laughter.

Star Beyond Shadow shines on "the path that leads eternally to God" with a luminosity tender and constant. Though Sibyl Pommer in this her third book reveals how the world stands at the crossroads to "the forest of terror" and "meadows of peace," this book stands chiefly as a jeweled shrine to the memory of her mother.

Now turn to prose by a master poet, prose that reasons and sings and prophesies on a theme and with a viewpoint that cannot help but be vital to UNITY readers, *Adjustment to Jesus*. Lawrence W. Neff, editor of America's strongest poetry journal, *Verse Craft*, author of *The Final Failure of Christianity* and other important religious contributions, discusses the claims of what we have called, "that ancient revolutionist: the soul." Declaring, "The one cure of priestly religion is prophetic religion," he emphasizes, "there is never the obligation of conformity to conditions as they are; always the inflexible requirement of making conditions what they ought to be."

RALPH CHEYNEY.

The Story of a Great American Woman

MARGARET FULLER. *By Mason Wade. New York City: The Viking Press.* $3.50.

Mason Wade, in this excellent biography, calls Margaret Fuller the "Whetstone of Genius." But Margaret had a modicum of genius of her own as well as the ability to sharpen genius in Emerson, Hawthorne, Alcott, and the other literary lights of her time. She was the first woman critic of any importance in American literature, and her reviews in Horace Greeley's *Tribune* rank along with Poe's critical reviews as the beginning of American literary criticism. Margaret was the first woman to popularize German thought in America, and her love for Goethe aroused the enthusiasm of Emerson and the others in the Transcendental Club. She was one of the first to bring America and Europe into mutual appreciation and understanding. A leader in the "feminist movement," she wrote and lectured in the hope of bettering the place and position of women in the world. Finally, her European travels brought her to Italy and to the fulfilment of her life in her marriage to the young Marchese Ossoli. The tragedy of the shipwreck, the death of Margaret, her husband, and little son, have often been told, and form the element for an endless retelling. Margaret's *magnum opus*, her history of the Italian struggle, was also lost, but speculation about it adds to the romance of her biography. The memorial in Cambridge forms a just summary of a great-souled woman:

> Margaret Fuller Ossoli,
> By birth a child of New England,
> By adoption a citizen of Rome,
> By genius belonging to the World.

CHARLES A. HAWLEY.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 130)

constant stream of messages and expressions of love and good will, *all* of which help me to know our Movement, widespread, hard-working, devoted and enthusiastic as its members are, can never die, but will in process of time, succeed. It will come silently, rushing to victory, when the toiling masses of all lands acknowledge the oneness and solidarity of all their lives. Now we are living through days, hard days, of ploughing and harrowing; the past seed-time has not been lost for we are here as "sowers," taking up the task others have handed on. So, comrade, it is good to hear from Holland, Denmark, Belgium, etc. Tell them all when you write I send my love and remembrances, especially tell our good friends in Denmark. I *am* better, not quite well, but making good progress and look-

(*Continued on page* 144)

Complaint—and Answer

Editor of UNITY:

For more than thirty years, I read Jenkin Lloyd Jones' UNITY. When by its own amusing admission, after that dear great man was gone, it became the only free, brave, and noble Editorial page in the land I parted with a name, "Unity," that had come to mean much to me. But yesterday a friend showed me a recent copy—still nobly stilted and delighted with itself. But it calls upon Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln to speak. That was adventure for John Haynes Holmes.

Would Dr. Holmes now be brave enough in UNITY to declare just what he would have done had he been Washington; had he been Lincoln. Would he have let the Tories have it? Would he have made no America?

Had he been Lincoln would he have let two nations be where one glorious nation now is?

UNITY and Dr. Holmes were ridiculous over Russia a little while ago. The sanity and the preaching power of Dr. Jones is gone. An empty shell stands in his long shadow. But will UNITY be brave enough to suggest what would we be, where would we be, had John Haynes Holmes been Washington or Lincoln.

ALBERT C. WILKINSON.

St. Paul, Minnesota.

[Reply]

After carefully perusing the above letter, I have gained the impression that its writer, Mr. Wilkinson, does not think much of me as the editor of this paper in succession to the late Jenkin Lloyd Jones. Well, he is not alone in that opinion. I had it myself a long time ago, when first I was invited to take Dr. Jones' place. When at last I accepted this invitation, I had no idea that I could do what Dr. Jones had done, or be what he had been. But I could at least emulate his noble example by being true to myself, speaking the truth as I saw it, and standing by my convictions no matter who disagreed or what the cost. This I have tried to do—and Mr. Wilkinson's letter clearly indicates that I have not wholly failed.

But there is more in Mr. Wilkinson's letter than a mere statement in contemptuous terms of disagreement with my opinions and policies as editor of UNITY. What Mr. Wilkinson is really trying to do is to set the present editor of UNITY against his predecessor, Jenkin Lloyd Jones, on the issue of war and peace. Talking in terms of Washington and Lincoln, he intimates that Dr. Jones believed in war, and would in this present crisis be advocating war for America as I am opposing it. All of which is false where it is not out-and-out malicious!

Mr. Wilkinson says that he read Jenkin Lloyd Jones' UNITY for more than thirty years. With what intelligence did he read it that he can find one iota of difference between Dr. Jones and myself on this war and peace issue? How does he dare defame the memory of "that dear great man" by arguing, in the name of Washington and Lincoln, that he would be a warmonger today as he refused to be a warmonger yesterday? In all his thirty years of reading, did Mr. Wilkinson never catch the glimmer of an idea that Jenkin Lloyd Jones was a pacifist who was opposed to war under all circumstances? Let me tell you some things, Mr. Wilkinson, about this saintly and heroic man whose name you use in vain:

In 1914, when Germany was smashing through Belgium, burning Louvain, devastating northern France, bombarding Rheims, waging war as she is waging it now with the most potent weapons available and in the most ruthless spirit conceivable, Dr. Jones wrote and published a book, entitled *Love for Battle-Torn Peoples.* In this book he expressed his love for Germany and the Germans and gave his reasons for this love.

When the Ford Peace Ship sailed for Europe on its mission of peace, Dr. Jones was on board. At the time the ship sailed, Germany was everywhere victorious in the most cruel war then known to modern times. Yet Dr. Jones sought peace on any terms that might be possible. He wanted to end the slaughter and send the soldiers home.

In 1917, when the United States was moving into the war, I asked Dr. Jones what he would do if we went in. He answered, "I'll nail my peace flag to the flagpole on Lincoln Centre, and oppose the war with every word I can speak and write." He did just that! He kept his peace flag flying until the government tore it down, and he opposed the war in UNITY, until the government suppressed the paper by taking away its second-class mailing privileges.

Don't you talk to me, Mr. Wilkinson, about Jenkin Lloyd Jones and his attitude toward war as editor of this paper. I was with him during all that dreadful period of the last war. At his invitation and with his applause, I was constantly writing editorials and articles for UNITY, in which I said then exactly what I am saying now. Never once did Dr. Jones fail to publish what I sent in to his office. It was my comfort, as it seemed to be his joy, that we were one in mind and spirit on this issue.

If you don't like UNITY's ideas today, Mr. Wilkinson, well and good. The editor is not infallible; he is used to differing opinion; he rejoices that he lives in a country, and himself edits a paper, in which everybody is free to state his mind. But be careful, Mr. Wilkinson, how you cite Jenkin Lloyd Jones, whose words you obviously never understood and whose spirit and teaching you now wantonly betray.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 143)

ing forward to seeing them *all* again. My affectionate greetings to you all.

GEORGE LANSBURY.

Somewhere in Russia

"Like Socrates, Citizens of the Whole World."

(The writer of this letter has never been out of Russia—for 17 years he has been an active member of the War Resisters' International.)

"Men, the vast majority of men, when independent of the will of others, see no meaning in the aim of having oneself mangled to bits, and on the contrary, see much meaning and feel an inexpressible joy in fraternal union.

"Is it not clear that the most important thing in the world is to clarify one's own true understanding of life in human terms, one's own inner consciousness which tends towards the general well-being? Is it not clear that enemy nations should leave behind that bestial animosity which is called forth by war, all palliatives and all doubtful methods, and keep to their demands for man's dignity and the inner consciousness? For it is on that basis alone that the edifice of universal peace can be built and the long-wished-for disarming of nations brought about. We do not know in what form that unification of mankind will be brought about, but we know that when it is, there will also come the end of the fostering of hostilities; it will be impossible for inner reasons. For all men will consider themselves, like Socrates, citizens of the whole world and not of separate nations. Recognition of the pernicious and adverse consequences of war will only be an additional illustration of this spirit.

"I sincerely hope that the events in this nightmare which is passing over Europe and which have been brought about unconsciously by our civilization and through illusion, will serve as a means toward the new life, and that the English nation, proud of its civilization, will take the lead in that direction.

"I learned the other day from the newspapers about our Chairman, George Lansbury.

"I am very glad to know that he is full of faith in the Russian people as regards the question of peace. But then all peoples want peace. However, I wonder what is the International doing now when the civilized peoples in Europe have already begun homicide which they don't consider a crime? It is precisely now that people must show their true and self-denying loyalty to the principles of peace."